

# Christianity and Crisis

*A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion*

Volume III, No. 4

MARCH 22, 1943

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

## Six Pillars of Peace

THE most recent declaration of the Federal Council Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, which has just been released to the press and the substance of which will be found on another page of this issue, may well win the attention of the public beyond the borders of the churches. It is an important statement partly as an illustration of the type of pronouncement which may appropriately issue from official Christian bodies. But its greater importance lies in the fact that, in our judgment, it furnishes the briefest, clearest and soundest agenda for post-war order which has yet been forthcoming from any source, within or outside the churches. It merits the closest study and discussion; and then, if such examination leads to agreement, vigorous advocacy.

The planning of world order involves three questions—What? Why? How? The Federal Council's Commission had given their attention initially to the second of these questions. Just a year ago, they issued a statement of "Basic Principles" which, last December, were formally adopted by the Federal Council itself in biennial session. Grounding their argument firmly on the reality of "a moral order, the laws of which are as imperative and inexorable as are those that order our physical world," they sought to disclose why that order must be controlling in nine major areas with which the peace must deal, and then went on to underscore the special responsibilities of Christians and their churches in winning acknowledgment and acceptance for the laws of the moral order. This charter of "Basic Principles" has been widely acclaimed.

The Commission has now taken the second step of indicating *what* those Principles imply in terms of six "Political Propositions." The attempt of Christians to discover the limits within which they may speak with authority in the political and economic realm has been greatly furthered in recent years by the recognition of "middle axioms." Middle axioms are propositions midway between broad general goals which are likely to claim ready acceptance but may

easily be neglected in practice, and concrete plans which are the province of technical experts.

The Commission's six "Political Propositions" are admirable examples of middle axioms. They define those problems for which international "political framework", "supervision", "organization", "procedures" *must* be provided, but they do not attempt to specify the precise form which such international structures must take. For example, it is declared that the peace "must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization . . . autonomy for subject peoples," but it is not said whether this should be accomplished through direct international administration of colonial areas, through international supervision of colonial administrations, through regional agencies of colonial supervision, through some other means, or through a combination of several. More important, each of the six Propositions points to the necessity of some kind of international instrument, but it is not said whether this demands a single over-all world body or whether the required ends might be accomplished through a series of instruments, perhaps of varying type, scope and authority.

In brief, these Propositions are not so general that they may win lip-service in principle and then be disregarded in practice. They are not so specific that they open churchmen to the charge of dogmatizing beyond the borders of their competence. The determination of the precise forms to implement the Propositions falls under the question "How?". This can be settled only on advice of experts in international administration and by agreement among the sovereign powers concerned. Whether it is appropriate for the churches to speak more specifically in the realm of the "how" is a question on which the Commission has thus far offered no judgment. Quite probably the answer depends upon whether statesmen are prepared to make earnest with the inescapable implications of the "what" without further prodding by churchmen.

However, it is the specifics of this statement, rather than its general form, which especially merit critical examination. It will not satisfy those who are committed to the immediate erection of a World Government with large powers and responsibilities; for it does not specifically recommend such a step. It will not satisfy those who propose dealing with each detailed issue as it arises, but without fundamental action on any of the larger continuing problems, for it clearly indicates why such pragmatic improvisation will not suffice. Thus it stakes a middle course between the two main schools of thought on the organization of peace—those who espouse a single over-all instrument of world order and those who favor a policy of “muddling through” by piece-meal solutions of separate problems. While there are supporters of both methods on each side of the Atlantic, on the whole, American idealism leans to “over-all” solutions, British sentiment toward “piece-meal” planning. The Commission’s Political Propositions offer median ground with some hope of winning adherence from both parties. Six areas of conflict for which some kind of international provision is essential are singled

out—political collaboration, international trade practice, treaty-change, backward peoples, armaments, intellectual and religious freedom. Less than this is to invite continuing wars. More than this may not be presently essential.

It is one of the merits of this document that its six points may be lifted from the rest of the declaration for independent study and adoption. And they are as appropriately worded for secular as for religious bodies. One of the greatest needs in the struggle for a just and lasting peace is that those whose fundamental aims are identical should speak with identical accents. Is it possible that these Political Propositions might first be adopted by all the major church bodies as their own, and that they might also serve as something of an Atlantic Charter for the planners of peace, to which group after group in nation after nation might give their adherence? Then, indeed, they might become, in the words of the Chairman of the Commission to whose hand they are mainly due, “six pillars of peace.”

H. P. V. D.

## Religion in Russia

N. S. TIMASHEFF

VERY often, the religious situation in Russia, before and after the Revolution, is discussed on the assumption that at the time of the Revolution, Greek Orthodoxy was a dead and mummified body, used by the Imperial Government as an instrument of stupefaction and oppression. Any sensible government coming after the Revolution had to bury this corpse. The methods used by the communists were perhaps a little too strong. But, in general, the removal of Orthodoxy from the Russian scene was a marked progress.

There are even persons who think that the Russian people, when giving power to the communists, realized that the communists were atheists, but still evaluated the communist rule as the lesser evil and consequently, at least tacitly, approved the anti-religious policy of the years to come.

The reasoning behind this assertion seems impeccable to one who lives in an orderly democratic society with widespread public education, as in the United States. But the communist revolution took place in a society where the democratic process of discussion was a novelty and where elementary literacy was possessed by no more than forty per cent of the adult population.

In such a society the competition for power, in

the midst of a revolution, assumes forms which are almost unimaginable to members of an orderly democracy; in any case, victory in such a competition has nothing in common with the mandate given to a party as the result of a general election. Before the Revolution, even among the intellectuals, only a minority had more than a vague idea about communism; the mass of the people, especially the peasants (about eighty per cent of the total population), had no knowledge whatsoever. On the eve of the Revolution of 1917, the party which finally inherited the power of the czars numbered 30,000 members.

The masses accepted the communists because they promised land, bread and peace. Nobody compared these values with other values, such as religion. This is the tragedy of revolution when the masses are not yet prepared for democratic processes. Like children, they concentrate their whole attention on one or two enticing points and are blind to anything else.

Consequently, from the fact that the Russian people gave power to the communists or, at least, tolerated their ascent to power, one cannot conclude that, for this people, religion, especially Greek Orthodoxy, was a negligible value. Despite many weaknesses, there was true religious life behind the petrified external

structure of the Greek Orthodox Church; there was faith in the flock; there was devotion and readiness for sacrifice.

This may be best proved by the fact of the survival of religion, despite more than two decades of consistent anti-religious policy on the part of the new Government. From the almost unconceivable resistance of the believers, it appears that Orthodoxy was highly valued by millions of men and women. In attacking it, the communists did not try to bury a corpse; they hurt a living corporate body and inflicted pain on millions of its members. Moreover, the corruption of the Church as an organization was not so bad as many would like to think; under the challenge of triumphant atheism, the hierarchy discovered the spiritual values which had been somewhat obscured under the Empire. Many died in the name of Christ, and the blood of the martyrs intensified the faith of believers and provoked many conversions, especially among intellectuals.

Is it not significant that not only faith survived, but also the Church organization and the institutions around it? The attempt to submit the Russian Church to a kind of Reformation failed because the believers wanted to see their Church as the continuation of that of their fathers and forefathers. What has changed is the attitude of the Church toward political and social problems; but the bond with secular power and with a particular social order never had, for Orthodoxy, any dogmatic value. Both the hierarchy and the flock have displayed a real capacity for discriminating between eternal and temporary values which, by necessity, coexist in a Church.

#### *Attack on Religion Necessary*

The attack on religion was not a necessary means for the elimination of an evil. Yet, for the communists, this attack was a necessity, since the new rulers believed in atheism as strongly as Christians believe in Christ. Their attitude toward the faith of the people was contempt, rejection and merciless hostility. Intolerance was an essential element in their program. They were certainly not democrats. Religion was one of the main obstacles to the creation of a new society composed of new men. Consequently, religion was to be uprooted.

In the course of the years of official anti-religion, there have been many changes in the intensity of the struggle, as well as in the means used by the government. One of the crudest attacks was launched as late as in 1937-38 on the ground of the necessity of eliminating the fifth column. This version has been endorsed by a number of pro-communist writers who were inclined to believe that, in 1937-38, bishops and priests organized espionage in favor of Germany and Japan, set fire to factories, caused accidents in coal mines, as stated in official indictments.

To those who believe in such nonsense, quite a few questions could be addressed. Do they know what Ralph Ingersoll has to say about the blood purge, namely, that in order not to leave a few traitors unmolested, scores of innocent people were executed? Do they know that, in December, 1938, Yezhoff, the great master of the purge, was dismissed and that early in 1939 many of his former subordinates were tried for having overdone the purge? Do they know of the official statement according to which, in 1937-38, the attack on religion "was carried out by the enemies of the people in order to foster hostility to the Soviet Government"? The implication is that the fifth column was not where they looked for it. Do they know that, since 1927, Acting Patriarch Sergius insisted that the bishops and priests under his jurisdiction be "loyal" to the Soviet Government, i.e., completely refrain from any anti-governmental activity? For one who knows all these facts, the charge against the bishops and priests cannot but appear incredible. The persecution of 1937-38 can be explained without assuming that fifth columnists were hidden in the Church. In the middle of 1937, those in power learned from a suppressed census that religion continued to live in the hearts of about half of the Russian people. In the fall of that year they had to carry out the first general election according to the Stalin Constitution. In spite of having elections well in hand, they still considered the possibility that the surprisingly strong survival of religion would influence the results. An attempt to behead the Church organization by attacking the bishops and priests was a logical response to the challenging situation they discovered to exist.

#### *Religion Could Not Be Uprooted*

The obvious failure of this last attack taught the communists a lesson: they learned that religion could not be uprooted from the soul of the Russian nation. This recognition opened a new chapter in the history of communist society, inaugurated early in 1939. About that time, the communists openly acknowledged that such acts as the christening of children, or religious marriage, or religious funerals, were no longer concealed as they had been a few years ago but were openly performed. A few months ago, it was reported that in one of the churches of Moscow a line of mothers could be observed waiting their turn for christening their children. Members of the Young Communist League, who according to the statute must be atheists, were reported to desire their marriage religiously consecrated. Soviet officials could be seen following funeral processions headed by priests. Acting Patriarch Sergius told a foreign visitor that since the outbreak of the war more people, especially more young people, attended church.



These facts, known from official Soviet sources or from reports of reliable foreign visitors, have been recently corroborated by a systematic inquiry into the religious sentiments of the Russians now in German occupied territories and in prison camps, made by a certain P. Perov, collaborator of the *Pravoslavnaia Rus*, published in Slovakia. The author comes to the conclusion that the Russians can be divided, according to their religious sentiments, into three groups. By far the largest group, composed of the great mass of the people, especially the peasants, has not forgotten the faith of their fathers. The anti-religious propaganda has failed to penetrate into the depths of their souls. Only the primitive superstitions and some church customs which too often were identified with real devotion, have been uprooted. The second group which is much smaller is composed of those who have lost all understanding of religion. Nevertheless, the sense of comradeship which has now developed into one of self-sacrifice, has given them an ethical norm which, although it has nothing in common with Christian ethics, is still a hopeful starting point. The third group consists of militant atheists whose purpose still is that of destroying religion in the name of science. Numerically this group is insignificant.

#### *The Interpretation of Christianity Revised*

The retreat of the official atheism corresponds to the persistence, even advance of religion. Early in 1939, anticipating an imminent war with Germany which could be won only if all the forces of the nation were united, the rulers decided to revise their interpretation of Christianity and to curb their anti-religious activity. It has been officially declared, in contrast to former declarations, that Christianity was not always an enemy of the working people and of progress. A direction to tone down anti-religious propaganda was given to the agencies entrusted with it. Forcible interference with worship in churches was prohibited. After more than a decade of living according to a revolutionary calendar and celebrating every sixth day as a holiday, Sunday was restored in its dignity of the official restday.

This revival of religion in a country where it was thought to have been wiped out is not a display put on by the Soviets to please the democratic world. It is a sign of the gradual return of normalcy in Soviet Russia. The startling changes in the attitude of communism toward religion are fully in line with the development of affairs in Russia which can be summed up in one sentence: While holding fast to most of the old principles in the social and political fields, Stalin had realized the necessity of making important concessions in the cultural field. And he had begun to make these concessions years before the

war, thus bringing the country again on the path which leads to normalcy.

After the outbreak of the war, the policy of concessions was accentuated. In response to a message of Acting Patriarch Sergius enjoining prayers and patriotic efforts to defeat the enemy of Russia and of humanity, the Godless Union declared: "If the servants of the Church honestly call upon the believers to fight against Fascism, we must not belittle this fact." The publication of anti-religious journals was discontinued three months after the outbreak of the war, and anti-religious museums were closed. Heavy taxes on the churches were substantially reduced. It is known that, unofficially, Russian priests, serving as privates in the Army, have been permitted to act as military chaplains and that the other privates are not prohibited to attend at divine services thus celebrated. This is the counterpart of the situation officially created by the permission granted to the Catholic priests to act as chaplains in the Polish military units organized in Russia. In October, 1941, the announcement of this permission provoked, in this country, a short but vivid discussion of the problem of religious freedom in Soviet Russia.

General religious education, however, remains prohibited, as well as the training of future priests in special theological seminaries. But, with the mitigation of the anti-religious activity of the Government, a substitute has been found which has been recently described by the Acting Patriarch. If a young man graduating from high school wishes to become a priest, he can apply to the Church; local ecclesiastical authorities suggest to him a program of study and provide him with the necessary books. After having studied for a certain time, the young man is examined by a bishop. If he passes this examination, and if he is known to possess the appropriate character traits, he is ordained deacon, then priest. Still later, the Acting Patriarch has managed to have a correspondence course for future priests printed on Government presses, and an appreciable number of ordinations have resulted. Officials who evidently had to know that the presses were being used for this purpose, obviously closed their eyes to it.

The most significant symptom of change is, perhaps, to be seen in the fact that, in the summer of 1942, a book has appeared in Moscow entitled *Truth about Religion in Russia*. In any country but Russia the publication of a similar book would not have astonished anybody. But, in Russia, its publication was at least unexpected. Have not the new rulers of Russia prohibited both reprinting of the Bible and importing it from foreign countries? And now a beautifully printed and copiously illustrated book on religion appears, comprising contributions of the

highest dignitaries of the Russian Orthodox Church, as well as of a number of priests and laymen belonging partly to the cultural *élite*, such as professors, doctors, or artists and partly to rank-and-file believers. It appears from the book that the Government has committed to quite a few clergymen the task of investigating the acts of German vandalism relating to the Church. This should be added to the fact that, in November, 1942, Metropolitan Nicholas of Kiev was appointed to the governmental commission for the investigation of "crimes committed by the German Fascist invaders."

In this book, the Acting Patriarch states, as he has many times done since 1930, that the Church is not inhibited in performing religious rites in accordance with its teaching; but he is silent about the fact that the Church is legally restricted to the performance of rites, that there is no religious education in the country, that anti-religious propaganda cannot be opposed outside the church buildings, that the Church is not permitted to carry on any social, cultural, or charitable activity. But, in the book, one finds the very significant statement that the Orthodox Church is sad about the fact that anti-religion is the official ideology of the ruling party.

This does not hinder the head of the Russian Orthodox Church from strongly opposing the ideas of those "bourgeois believers" who regret the termination of the old Church-State intimacy and to express the hope that, being independent of the State, the Church may better fulfill its salutary task. He states also that the Church could not separate itself from the nation and never could accept benefits from the nation's enemy. This is an unambiguous response to the challenging situation created by the German invaders in the occupied provinces where they try to organize a Russian Orthodox Church which would be as subservient to them as the Church in Imperial Russia was to the Emperors. In the book, there are frequent mentions of special prayers for the liberation of Russia from the anti-Christian Germans and of special divine services held in towns and villages reconquered by the Russian armies.

As compared with the situation which obtained in Russia in 1937-38, when religion was severely persecuted, the change is drastic. This change does not **however** signify the conversion of the Soviet Government to religion or even to an attitude of tolerance toward religion, as understood in this country. Closed churches are not reopened; exiled and imprisoned bishops and priests are not released. In the course of a totalitarian war against a formidable external enemy, it was necessary to achieve a truce with a substantial group within the nation antagonized by religious persecution. Whether this truce will continue when this war is over, depends on many

circumstances. If the contact with the democratic allies of the Soviet State is strong enough to cause even a partial democratization of that State, tolerance will prevail. If, on the contrary, the Soviet State is not affected by that contact, then, after the war is over, its leaders will be free to choose between tolerance and religious blitzkrieg, and there is no means to predict what their choice will be.

But, whatever their choice will be, one fact will dominate the situation: this is the persistence of religion in spite of twenty-five years of official anti-religion. A nation which proved to be able to resist for so many years will continue to resist indefinitely, up to the termination of the revolutionary cycle. The problem is not so much whether Russia will once more become a Christian nation—under the crust of official atheism she still is one—but whether and when the State will officially return to Christianity.

## Mutual Security Comes First

**R**ECENT discussions of the situation in North Africa have brought into the foreground a question which is not always faced with the frankness its importance deserves, namely, which is the major cause for which the Allies are fighting—freedom or security? It would, of course, be true to say that they are fighting for both—freedom to realize their own ideals in their own way, and protection against threats from without which would make this realization impossible. Unfortunately the matter is not so simple, for different social groups, like the individuals of which they are composed, will interpret the freedom for which they are fighting differently. To some it will mean the freedom of the New Deal with its emphasis upon deliverance from want; to others the continuance of the system of free competition, which in their thinking alone makes social progress possible. When the attempt is made to define more exactly which of these two conceptions of freedom should control the political strategy of the Allies, difference appears and tension arises. Unless it is realized that something even more fundamental is at stake than the achievement of freedom in either of these senses there is danger of divided counsels which will make a united approach to post-war problems difficult if not impossible.

No one has put this more clearly than Sir Norman Angell in his various books and in none more clearly than in the last. He has been reminding us that the primary object for which the war is being fought is security. It is the primary object because without security—that is some form of international order which has promise of permanence—freedom in either of the two senses above contrasted is unobtainable. If security is achieved, it will then be possible for

those who differ in social theory to settle their differences by the method of free discussion and legal enactment which recognized government makes possible.

It is not easy for liberals, either in Church or State, to put security first. They see so clearly the dangers to which the type of society in which big business feels most at home commits them; they know so well how easily, under the guise of free competition, the monopolistic practices with which fascism has familiarized them may reappear.

Yet there is danger that too close identification of the freedoms of the Atlantic Charter with the particular conception of freedom which is most dear to liberals may blind them to the fact that in order to lay a foundation for a society as complex as our modern society has become, one must be able to find a basis so broad in its appeal that it can serve to unify social groups which differ as widely as the Soviets of Russia, the appeasers of Vichy, the stand-patters of big business and the liberals of the New Deal. Democracy as a political system guarantees to those who live under it only the right to make their views prevail by legal means, never the power to exclude from equal participation those who from the liberal point of view seem misguided or dangerous.

It is no doubt true that such a statement of the

issue is an over simplification. Under the abnormal conditions produced by the war it is possible to hide under the cloak of impartiality policies and procedures which are really partisan. How far this danger has already been yielded to by those in control of the policy of the Allied nations or any of their representatives, it is not easy to determine. In default of definite evidence the imputation of improper motives is dangerous. It must never be forgotten that motives which seem to many liberals improper may be held by some of their associates in the Allied cause in perfect good faith. To impugn the motives of those from whom one differs tends to divert attention from the real issue, which is to determine what procedure will most speedily re-establish the ordered society on which freedom in any intelligible sense of the word alone depends.

If the point thus made is well taken, it would appear that there is laid upon liberals a double duty: first to cooperate whole heartedly with men of every nation or social creed who, whatever their political philosophy, believe in an ordered government enough to be willing to cooperate in bringing it into existence; then in the more limited political sphere to work with every means in their power to make the particular type of freedom in which they believe more appealing and so ultimately more controlling.

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN.

## The World Church: News and Notes

### A New Report on Just and Durable Peace

The Federal Council's Commission to Study a Just and Durable Peace, under the chairmanship of John Foster Dulles, has just issued a new report presenting a series of propositions, which in the opinion of the Commission, represent the logical political consequences of Christian presupposition in regard to international order. In introducing the Propositions, the Commission declares in part:

"The American people again find themselves in an era of critical decision. It must now be determined, this time in worldwide terms, whether men are capable of establishing good government from reflection and choice or whether they will continue to be buffeted about by force and by accident. Now, as before, it is reserved to the people of this country to play a decisive role. Now, more than ever, a wrong choice of the part we shall act will involve us in the general misfortune of mankind. . . .

"Many now ask: What shall we do?

"The first and paramount task of the Christian churches remains that of bringing more persons to subject their lives to the will of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. . . .

"But there is a secondary task. . . . The course of events is such that a time for action is at hand.

"Military peril has dramatized, for all to see, the need for international cooperation. But as military victory becomes more certain and draws more near, that need will be less obvious. As we come to grips with the appalling moral, social and material aftermaths of Axis rule, transitory issues will arise to perplex and divide the United Nations. These may loom large and obscure the fundamentals and incline us to relapse into reliance only upon our own strength. Thus, if our nation does not make the right choice soon, it may never be made in our time. . . .

"We have stated our Propositions in simple and minimum terms. We recognize that as so stated there is much latitude as to their form and detailed content and as to the timing of their full realization. These matters are important and their determination will involve much honest differences of opinion which, ultimately, must be reconciled. But the Propositions, as stated by us, serve to force the initial and vital decision on the direction in which this nation will move. They force that decision in relation to six major areas within which the factual interdependence of the world has become such as to require political mechanism for cooperative action. If the six Propositions we enunciate become an official program of this nation, we will be committed to move, by definite steps, to bring ourselves into an ordered relationship with others. Only



if the nations join to do this can we escape chaos and recurrent war. Only if the United States assumes a leadership can it be done now. For we, more than any other nation, have the capacity to influence decisively the shaping of world events. If the future is to be other than a repetition of the past, the United States must accept a responsibility for constructive action commensurate with its power and opportunity. . . ."

#### *The Six Political Propositions*

"1. The peace must provide the political framework for a continuing collaboration of the United Nations and, in due course, of neutral and enemy nations.

"2. The peace must make provision for bringing within the scope of international agreement those economic and financial acts of national governments which have widespread international repercussions.

"3. The peace must make provision for an organization to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing underlying conditions.

"4. The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.

"5. The peace must establish procedures for controlling military establishments everywhere.

"6. The peace must establish in principle, and seek to achieve in practice, the right of individuals everywhere to religious and intellectual liberty."

#### *Exposition*

The Commission gives a detailed exposition of each Proposition. The exposition of Proposition One is:

"The interdependence of the world is strikingly proved by the events that led up to this war. That interdependence calls for permanent political collaboration. Such collaboration should, as quickly as possible, be universal. But practically, the initial nucleus is the United Nations who have already been forced, by events, to collaborate.

"The degree of collaboration can properly be related to the degree of interdependence and thus any universal scheme may contain within its framework provision for regional collaboration. Europe particularly illustrates the need for regional collaboration. To continue there the uncoordinated independence of some twenty-five sovereign states will assure for the future that, as in the past, war will be a frequently recurrent event."

#### **Preaching in Holland**

A recent article on "Preaching in Holland" reveals to what degree the Christian Church is alive, not only to the danger of Nazi corruption, but also to the peril of a too simple identification of political with final religious ends. The article declares: "Without the discipline of sound exegesis all sorts of strange doctrines slip in. Those few clergy who have allowed themselves to be won by the new order . . . succeed in introducing into their sermons all kinds of theories of race, blood and soil. . . . But we also see many clergy

make themselves the bearers of the national tradition in the pulpit in the opposite direction. This temptation is very great in an occupied country. The national feeling of every good Dutchman, whether pastor or layman, is very strong. Also the national aversion to the foreigner coincides with proper Christian rejection of strange doctrines. . . . Thus we are continually tempted to see Holland as the land of Canaan. People commit the fatal error of applying texts of the Old Testament which speak of Israel as an elect nation not only to the Church but to the Netherlands. . . . This erroneous identification gives a pharisaical character to sermons."

Only a very healthy Christianity is capable of resisting such tendencies toward pharisaism in times of war. Perhaps the Christians of free nations may learn here from those of occupied ones.

#### **Religious Sentiment in Britain**

The *Christian News-Letter* reports some interesting results from a poll on the status of religion in Britain, taken by Mass-Observation which is the British counterpart of our Gallup Poll. According to the report 16% of those questioned reported that the war had strengthened their religious faith and 9% that it had been weakened by the war. On the other hand only 3% of local churches reported increased church attendance and 24% reported a decrease.

According to the report about half of the population has some interest in religious faith and pray, at least irregularly. Only one-tenth of the population is however linked closely with organized religion. Fifty-one percent agreed with the Archbishop of Canterbury that "the church has the right and the duty to declare the principles of true social life" and only 14% disagreed. On the other hand only about 10% believe that the church will play a significant part in post-war construction.

#### **British Churches Support Beveridge Plan**

The Executive Committee of the British Council of Churches based the following resolution on the Beveridge Social Security Plan:

"We believe Christian people should and will welcome the proposals of the Beveridge Report as being in accord with Christian principles. The proposals embody the principle of social solidarity in that they both require from the individual, a contribution to his own security and call upon the more privileged members of the community to take a larger share in lifting the burden of insecurity which modern industrialism has laid on a section of their fellows. They thus express a new sense of community and should be supported by all who believe that we are 'members one of another.'

"We do not concur in the view that what the Report proposes would sap the springs of initiative and enterprise, believing rather that insecurity is in general more deadening than a reasonable measure of security."

The resolution considered the problem of enforced idleness particularly and expressed the conviction that: "Men need not only to be freed from want but also to be

# Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

601 West 120th St., New York, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

DOROTHY CLEMENS, *Editorial Assistant*

occupied in useful and significant work if their moral natures are to be satisfied. Freedom from futility is as important as freedom from want."

They accepted the fact that the social insurance plan points to a more planned social economy and declares: "... the further we move in this direction the more vigilant do we need to be as to the extent to which the inner and outer liberties of men, whether as individuals or in groups, are imperilled or enhanced.

"We believe that the threat to liberty incident to a planned economy will be less in proportion as industry is recognized as an instrument of larger human purpose and organized in direct relation to it. This means that the personal aspect of industry must be held in view, no less than its material aspect, and the quality of life no less than economic security or financial gain."

### Dr. Temple on Christian Resistance

Speaking before a German Lutheran Church in London on the occasion of Martin Niemoeller's birthday the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, paid tribute to the brave resistance of Christians both Catholic and Protestant, in Germany to Nazi tyranny.

He called attention, however, to the fact that most church protests were prompted by "self-defense" and did not include the whole range of "outraged justice and brotherly love." He declared that he knew of no German protests against the Nazi inhumanity against the Jews and compared this silence to the action of Christians in Holland and France who "at great risk to themselves and their churches condemned the treatment of the Jews."

The Archbishop declared. "What is at stake is not merely the survival of ecclesiastical institutions but the capacity of the Christian fellowship to give fearless testimony to the truth."

### The Strafing of Life Boats

To the Editor:

I have just listened to two news broadcasts describing the clean-up job of American Airmen on the 22-ship convoy near New Britain. Both featured a vivid description of the strafing of *life boats* carrying survivors of warships. This bragging was shocking and surprising in view of the many protests Americans and British have made regarding the savage and heathenish actions of Japanese and Nazis in doing exactly the same thing. I recall too the report (eye witness) of Cecil Browne in the sinking of the *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* that the Japanese left the men in life boats and rafts safe and most of them were picked up.

What I wish to ask is: "Should not this action of strafing life boats be challenged?" The *Christian News Letter* in Britain has tried to maintain that our actions should differ from our enemies not only in ultimate aim but also in the discrimination we show in observing some few "rules of war." If this goes absolutely unchallenged I am sure that the reaction of many Americans will be that we are no better than our enemies, possibly a little worse. This fits in with the report that the reason no Japanese prisoners were taken on Guadalcanal was not that the Japanese would not surrender but that the American order was given that no prisoners were to be taken as there was no extra food for extra mouths. I hope that *Christianity and Crisis* will challenge this blatant bragging about what we ourselves have officially condemned.

REV. HARRY VER STRATE,

Chairman, Committee on International Justice and Goodwill, Reformed Church in America.

Mr. Ver Strate is quite right. The policy to which he refers must be challenged. We have been trying to secure information to determine to what degree the incidents referred to represent official policy and hope to have something more to say about it.

### Christian Conference on War and Peace

You may obtain more information about the Christian Conference on War and Peace by writing to Mr. Richard M. Fagley, Secretary, World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, 70 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

### Authors In This Issue

William Adams Brown is Professor Emeritus of Union Theological Seminary.

N. S. Timasheff was Professor of Sociological Jurisprudence at the Polytechnic Institute at St. Petersburg and at Prague. Since coming to this country he was Lecturer of Sociology at Harvard University and is Professor of Sociology at Fordham University. He is the author of "Religion in Soviet Russia, 1917-1942."

Public Library  
Woodward & Kirby Aves.  
Detroit, Mich.

650 11-44